Sri R. M. PATIL.—Steps have been taken. I need not repeat them.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಟಿ. ಸೀತಾರಾಮರಾವ್.—ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ 'ಎ' ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 'ಬಿ' ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ವೈದ್ಯಕೀಯ ಸೇವೆಗಳ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಔಷಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಯಿಲೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನೂ ಓದಿದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ, ಈ ರೋಗ ಹಬ್ಬುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಬ್ಬುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರ ಅರ್ಥಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ರೋಗ ಹಬ್ಬಿತ್ತು ಮತ್ತು ಹತೋಟಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಅರ್ಥವಿದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಔಷಧದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಮಾಡಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ, ರೋಗ ಪ್ರಸರಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂತು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಔಷಧಿಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗಳಿವೆ ಅವೆಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೂ ಔಷಧಿಯನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ದವಾಖಾನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮದ್ದನ್ನೂ ಪೂರೈಕೆ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

Sri A. R. KARISIDDAPPA.—May I know the present position regarding the spread of flu in that area ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—So far as Belgaum City is concerned, in February there were 95 attacks and no deaths. In March there were 764 attacks and no deaths. In April, upto 9th April there were 187 attacks and no deaths.

Memorandum by H.A.L. Employees regarding their Demands.

Q.—3474. Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the Employees' Union of Hindustan Aircraft Ltd., has submitted any memorandum to the Government in respect of their demands ;

(*b*) if so when, and the action taken in that regard ;

(*c*) the reasons for the delay in referring the demands of the Union to the Tribunal ?

A.—Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The memorandum was received by Government on 11th October 1955. A report from the Commissioner of Labour was called for. Conciliation having failed in respect of all the demands, a report of failure of conciliation proceedings was sent by the Commissioner of Labour to Government on 22nd February 1956 and 31st March 1956. The Government of India were consulted in the matter. In the meanwhile, the Association also continued direct negotiation with the management of Hindustan Aircraft Ltd., and being unsuccessful, informed Government on 19th July 1957 that the dispute may be referred for adjudication. Government accordingly referred the two demands for D. A. and House Rent for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal by Government Orders dated the 28th September and 19th November 1957, and as regards the remaining demands, the parties were informed that they do not warrant a reference for adjudication.

(*c*) The question of referring the demands for adjudication was held up as negotiations were going on between the workers and the management.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Has the Government come to know that there is discontentment in the labour due to the inordinate delay in referring the demands for adjudication ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—There might be discontent, but it is not attributable to any delay and the delay as premised in the question is not correct.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—In your answer you have stated that the Government received a memorandum on the 11th October 1955 and the ultimate date when it was referred to adjudication was 19th November 1957. More than two years elapsed.....

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—As late as 19th July 1957, *i.e.*, two years after the demand was first formulated, the Association wrote to the Government saying that negotiations with the management were going on and that therefore the Government need not refer it to adjudication.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—The Government say that out of about 18 demands only the demands

in respect of D.A. and house rent allowance have been referred or warrant reference to adjudication. On what basis have they come to that conclusion ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The Government is entitled to come to a correct conclusion. It did so and thought that two demands were worthy of reference to the adjudication and the bulk of them were negotiated and practically settled. They thought that a few of them were not worthy of being considered at all and they were not considered.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—In spite of such a long time that has elapsed, has the Government made any effort to give any interim relief with regard to these demands ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Relief cannot be granted by the Government. The Government can only refer them to the Tribunal and the Government has done its very best in this particular matter to see that as much relief as possible was made available to the employees by persuasion and negotiations. The Government have made almost herculian efforts to bring about settlement.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—In the answer it is also stated that the Government of India were consulted in this matter. After consulting the Government of India, has this Government come to the conclusion that interim relief should be given to the employees ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am sorry I did not express myself in such a manner as to be fully understood. Relief cannot be granted by the State Government. The only relief that the Government can give is to refer the demands to adjudication. If that is to be considered as relief, it has been given.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know the nature of the other demands that were not referred to adjudication ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The demands were 18 in number and they were in respect of attendance bonus, dearness allowance, house rent allowance, free transportation, night shift allowance, heating allowance, provident fund, gratuity, display of notice, colony house rent, outstation allowance, etc.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—These demands were not referred to adjudication. Was the decision taken by this Government or in consultation with the Government of India ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—In taking decisions this Government does not consult the Central Government, but, being a party, like any other party, the Central Government is consulted. I may invite the attention of the House to a press communique that was issued in which it was stated that besides two demands that were referred to the Tribunal there were a number of them on which agreement was concluded. The draft agreement was kept ready and it was signed by the employers but not by the employees for reasons best known to themselves.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is it not a fact that even in respect of those demands that were refused to be referred to adjudication, the Association represented to the Government that its negotiation with the management has failed ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Whether agreement has been arrived at or whether the negotiation has failed is a matter which I am not able to understand. I would like to be further enlightened on that point.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—In view of the present situation, has the Government of Mysore thought fit to request the Government of India for any interim relief to be given to the labourers ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, this Government has tried something better, namely, to persuade the Central Government and the employers to come to the conclusion. A committee is constituted. Even when I had been to Delhi, I had a talk over the matter and we have done all that is possible and something good may come out of it. I personally feel that it is rather much better that details are not discussed though this House is supreme, and the Hon'ble House is entitled to know the details.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Can you fix a time limit within which we may expect something to take place ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—This Government cannot fix a time limit. It is for the Central Government and it is for the tribunal. How this Government can place a time limit, is not very easy to understand.

Removal of the Inscription on the Facade of Vidhana Soudha.

Q.—3477. Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapoor).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the estimated expenditure involved in erasing the inscription "Government Work is God's Work" at the main entrance of the Vidhana Soudha and for inscribing a new one ;

(*b*) at whose instance has this work been taken up and when ?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) Rs. 1,638 for the erasure of the inscription. No new inscription has been put up.

(*b*) Under orders of the Government in October 1957.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Sir, will the Government say when the actual orders were passed for erasure of the inscription ?

*Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—It was decided on 5th September 1957. One word of explanation. In my reply to the general debate when a question was put to me, I remember to have stated that the expenditure incurred on this item was something like Rs. 5,600 or 6,500. It is not correct. The correct figure is furnished in the printed answer now before the Hon'ble House. The cost of the work is only Rs. 1,638. The reason for this confusion is this : The Government decided to erase it and asked for an estimate. The Engineers submitted an estimate for about Rs. 6,000 for a number of items—scaffolding, scrapping the existing inscription, for providing background, for inserting the inscription SATYAMEVA JAYATHE, drilling holes and all that. This estimate was for Rs. 6,650. Then the Government Architect said that the building will speak for itself and no inscription is necessary to replace it. Therefore we decided on erasing the existing inscription and that costs only Rs. 1,638 as given in the answer. That correction may be noted.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Was the work given to a contractor ?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—It was done departmentally.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—May I know, Sir, the compelling reason for Government to take out this matter at that time giving priority over many other things ?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—It is not a question of giving priority. As I already said, there were some adverse comments and we also considered it. Government work cannot be God's work, so far as I have understood Sir. God's work as I have known is devotion, worship, having faith in God.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Who are the Members of the Committee ?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—The Members of the Committee are : The Minister for Public Works, Chairman. The Chief Secretary, the Secretary, P.W.D. There are some more member . It is a departmental committee.

ಪತ್ರಂ ಪುಷ್ಪಂ ಫಲಂ ತೋಯಂ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ ಪುಷ್ಪದ ಕಾಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. 1,500 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ನಂಬಿಳ ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಬದಲು ಹಾಗೆ ಬರೀ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ಪುಷ್ಪಂ ಫಲಂ ತೋಯಂ ಎಂದರೆ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ?. ದೇವರ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೇರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾನೂನು ಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾದಂಥಾದ್ದು. ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮೇಲಿನ ಮನೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಒಬ್ಬ ನಾಯಕರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಯೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೋ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ನಕ್ಕರು ಎಂದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೂ ದೇವರ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೂ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ವೇದವಾಕ್ಯವೋ, ಮಂತ್ರವೋ ಅಥವಾ ಗೀತೆಯನ್ನೋ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಶ್ರದ್ಧೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ

*Asterisk indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned.